UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
27th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 16 November 1993
at 3 p.m.
~~New York~~

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

CONTENTS

DECISIONS ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within *one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.27
19 January 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

93-82426 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

DECISIONS ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS (continued) (A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.2, L.9, L.13/Rev.2, L.15*, L.23, L.26/Rev.2, L.37, L.44/Rev.1, L.48 and L.51)

Draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.23, L.26/Rev.2, L.37, L.44/Rev.1 and L.51

Introduction (or withdrawal) of the draft resolutions

1. Ms. MASON (Canada), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1, said that among the original sponsors were countries which in the past had been unable to support even a procedural text on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for weapons purposes. She was particularly grateful to the delegations of the United States and India for their assistance in the drafting of a text which could command the support of the whole international community and be adopted without a vote. The title of the item had been amended to reflect more accurately the subject-matter of the proposed treaty. The heart of the draft resolution lay in paragraph 1 which recommended the negotiation in the most appropriate international forum of a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. The text did not specify the forum or a time-frame for negotiation of the treaty. Canada would like to see the negotiations take place as soon as possible, for the first priority was to ensure the successful launch of the negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

2. Mr. CHANDRA (India) said that his delegation was happy to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1. The most appropriate international forum for negotiation of a treaty was the Conference on Disarmament, and the negotiations ought to begin at an early date. India did not think that the proposed treaty could have an adverse effect on civilian nuclear programmes.

3. Two major elements of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.23 submitted by India, i.e. a comprehensive ban on the testing of nuclear weapons and the complete cessation of the production of fissile material for military purposes, had been satisfactorily covered by two separate draft resolutions of which India was a sponsor; India therefore withdrew draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.23 in order to avoid any redundancy in the Committee's work.

4. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.37, said that until nuclear weapons were completely eliminated the non-nuclear-weapon States must be provided with legally binding assurances that such weapons would not be used against them. The draft resolution was based on General Assembly resolution 47/32, which had been adopted by an overwhelming majority, and it appealed to all States to work actively towards a common formula which could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character in order to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. It was to be hoped that the draft resolution would enjoy the widest support in the Committee.

5. Mr. KANTOLA (Finland) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1, for it thought that a treaty banning the production of fissile material for military purposes would strengthen the existing non-proliferation instruments. An effective verification system, with responsibility entrusted to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), ought to be the central element of the treaty. The Conference on Disarmament was the most appropriate forum for the negotiations. The nuclear Powers would clearly have special responsibilities in the negotiations, in which IAEA should participate. Finland was ready to take an active part in the process, which the international community should launch in 1994.

6. Mr. CALOVSKI (former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.26/Rev.2, said that the self-explanatory changes made in the text were the outcome of fruitful consultations between interested delegations. In the first line of paragraph 3 in the English text, the article "the", inadvertently placed before the words "Balkan States", should be deleted.

7. The CHAIRMAN, introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.51, thanked all the delegations which had participated in the drafting of the text. The aim was to restructure the Committee's annual agenda on the basis of the thematic approach described in paragraph 2. He was willing to continue his consultations on the rationalization of the Committee's work with a view to improving the effectiveness thereof, as he was requested to do in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which he hoped could be adopted without a vote.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.2 and A/C.1/48/L.9

Decisions on the draft resolutions

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.2

8. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.2 entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament" should now read: Australia, Bolivia, Finland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, France, Honduras, Indonesia, Japan, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Norway, Russian Federation, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

9. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.2 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.9

10. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.9 entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water" should now read: Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Gabon, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, United Republic of Tanzania and Venezuela.

11. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.9.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

12. The draft resolution was adopted by 99 votes to 3, with 40 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1

13. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the mistake in paragraph 4 of the Spanish text would be corrected. He announced that the list of sponsors of the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices" should now read "Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cameroon, Denmark, Finland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, United States of America and Uruguay.

14. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

Explanation of position after the decision

15. Mr. DANIELI (Israel) said he had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1 on the principle that a prohibition on the production of fissionable material for military purposes subsumed the notion of a freeze on nuclear weapons in the Middle East. However, the specific modalities for the implementation of such a resolution could not be addressed in isolation from the peace process, in all its aspects, or from global action to reduce tension and limit armaments.

16. Ms. DUNCAN (New Zealand), supported by Ms. MASON (Canada), said that her country and Australia were deeply committed to the cause of nuclear disarmament and had very much regretted having to abstain in the vote. However, the text of the draft resolution, in particular the preamble, did not faithfully reflect the substance of the discussions which had taken place and the conclusions which had been reached at the latest meeting of the States parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water.

17. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America) said he had voted against draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.9 because he did not think that a conference to amend the partial test-ban treaty was the appropriate venue for negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Furthermore, the fact that some of the provisions of the resolution implied a lack of confidence in the Conference on Disarmament as a forum for negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty was not likely to promote the success of the exercise.

18. Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Russian Federation) said that he had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.9 because he thought that it should be possible to adopt a single consensus resolution on the question of nuclear-weapon tests; that would be the best way to resolve the problem of the test ban within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. The situation with regard to the amendment of the 1963 Treaty had totally changed since the Conference on Disarmament had reached agreement that negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty would be initiated. There was no justification for continuing the parallel process of amending the 1963 Treaty, since that process would divert attention from the negotiations within the Conference on Disarmament and gave the illusion that there was a realistic alternative to those negotiations. There was, in fact, no alternative, for two reasons. First, amending the 1963 Treaty could not lead to a comprehensive test ban since it did not affect two nuclear Powers which were not parties to it. Second, under the provisions of the 1963 Treaty, such an amendment could not be adopted because all the initial parties to the Treaty were not in agreement on the subject. The Amendment Conference had already played its part, and all attention should now focus on negotiations for a comprehensive test ban within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

19. His delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1 because it had always favoured the conclusion of an internationally verifiable treaty on the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons or other explosive nuclear devices. It thought that negotiations on such a treaty should be undertaken within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament, the only forum for multilateral negotiations in the field of disarmament. It regretted that paragraph 1 of the draft resolution contained the imprecise - not

(Mr. Berdennikov, Russian Federation)

to say ambiguous - phrase "the most appropriate international forum"; that phrase was subject to misinterpretation and could lead to an unjustifiable delay in the launching of the negotiations, especially since previous General Assembly resolutions on the subject dealt explicitly with the problem of the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapon purposes within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2 and A/C.1/48/L.37

Explanation of vote before the vote

20. Mr. NEAGU (Romania) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.37 because his country attached great importance to the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The best safeguard would obviously be general and complete nuclear disarmament but, pending the attainment of that goal, it was necessary to strengthen the non-proliferation regime.

21. International arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should take the form of a binding international agreement, which should provide both positive and negative security assurances and should ensure the equality of all States which renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

22. To circumvent the difficulties of devising a universally acceptable common formula, it would be useful to envisage several approaches, such as those put forward within the Conference on Disarmament. At all events, the climate seemed favourable for the adoption of an international instrument on the subject, as illustrated by the fact that the five nuclear Powers were now parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. However, no headway could be made in the negotiations unless both the nuclear-weapon and the non-nuclear-weapon countries were willing to show a greater degree of flexibility and mutual understanding.

23. Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would, as in previous years, abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.37. It would do so because the draft resolution did not establish the necessary relationship between the assurances required of the nuclear Powers and a legally binding commitment on the part of non-nuclear-weapon States not to acquire or produce nuclear weapons, a commitment which they could make by acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

24. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada and New Zealand, said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.37 because he believed it was imperative to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. He emphasized, however, that non-nuclear-weapon States should show proof of their commitment to the cause of nuclear disarmament by acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and other relevant regional agreements. The question of negative security assurances could not be considered in isolation from efforts to strengthen the international nuclear non-proliferation

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

regime. For that reason he would have liked the draft resolution to be more explicit with respect to the obligations of non-nuclear-weapon States.

25. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", should now read: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Sudan and Viet Nam.

26. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Ukraine, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

27. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2 was adopted by 102 votes to 21, with 23 abstentions.

28. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.37, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", should now read: Bangladesh, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Madagascar, Nepal, Pakistan, Panama, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Viet Nam.

29. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.37.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

30. The draft resolution was adopted by 142 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Explanations of vote after the vote

31. Ms. DUNCAN (New Zealand) said that she had abstained during the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2 because she did not find the wording satisfactory, even though she shared the goals set forth in it. Specifically, the draft Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons annexed to the resolution would not, in her delegation's view, make a practical

(Ms. Duncan, New Zealand)

contribution to the nuclear disarmament process. New Zealand believed that only the total elimination of nuclear weapons could provide a certain guarantee in that area and it would therefore continue to focus its efforts on the adoption of practical measures which would promote the attainment of that goal.

32. Mr. KANTOLA (Finland) said that he had voted against draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.13/Rev.2 because the text seemed to him to be too far removed from current realities. The end of the cold war had in fact significantly reduced the risks of a generalized nuclear war. For that reason, the efforts of the international community with regard to nuclear disarmament should focus mainly on non-proliferation.

33. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia) said that he had abstained during the vote because the adoption of a Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons could have implications for the maintenance of strategic stability based on deterrence. Australia would, however, support a single binding no-first-use assurance by the nuclear-weapon States.

34. Mr. ERRERA (France) said that France had always had reservations regarding the resolution in question. He recalled that, at the previous session, France had deliberately changed its position and voted in favour of resolution 47/50 in the hope of placing the discussion concerning negative assurances on a new basis since the five nuclear Powers were now all parties to the NPT. France had also wished to encourage the sponsors of the draft resolution to take account of the fact that there was no consensus regarding the possibility of negotiating a binding legal instrument and establishing a connection between security assurances made to non-nuclear-weapon States and a binding legal commitment on their part not to acquire or produce nuclear weapons such as that found in the NPT. Having noted that its appeal at the forty-seventh session had not received a response, France had decided, regretfully, to abstain during the vote at the current session.

35. Mr. HU Xiaodi (China) said that, although his delegation believed that some of the wording in the draft resolution could be improved further, it had decided to vote in favour of it since the draft Convention annexed to it could be taken as a useful basis for negotiations towards the attainment of a complete prohibition on the use of nuclear weapons.

36. Mr. BANDURA (Ukraine) said that, as a country which had inherited a large quantity of nuclear weapons following the break-up of the former USSR, Ukraine understood very well the need for steps to protect non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of such weapons. Ukraine warmly welcomed the efforts of the Conference on Disarmament and other United Nations organs to find a formula that would be acceptable to all non-nuclear-weapon States and believed that the draft resolution would advance that process. In particular, he emphasized that the lack of legally binding assurances was one of the principal obstacles to the creation of a denuclearized world in which States would refrain from establishing their own nuclear arsenals. The negotiations which Ukraine was actively conducting with a view to implementing the agreements already concluded did not always produce the desired results for the very reason that no satisfactory solution to the problem had so far been found at the international

(Mr. Bandura, Ukraine)

level. For that reason, Ukraine had joined the consensus that had emerged on the question and had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.15* and L.48

37. Mr. EL TINAY (Sudan) introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48, said that the sponsors had taken into account the realities of the post-cold-war era and the positive developments which had occurred in the region, in particular the signing of the Declaration of Principles between the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and Israel. Having said that, however, Israel should not take advantage of the agreement - which was but one stage along the road towards the establishment of a just and comprehensive peace - to disguise the fact that negotiations with the Arab countries of the region were at an impasse as a result of Israel's categorical refusal to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories which it had taken by force in 1967.

38. Citing official Israeli statements, he asserted that Israel could also not hide the fact that it had nuclear weapons. In that context, he had been surprised to note that the Israeli delegation had subordinated the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons to the question of the Middle East peace process when, at each session of the General Assembly, a resolution had been adopted calling upon Israel to renounce possession of nuclear weapons and accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. After intense consultations, the Arab countries had maintained that the draft resolution should be worded in such a way as to obligate all the States of the region to place all their nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. Since the text of the draft resolution was quite different from that of previous resolutions on the subject with respect to both form and content, he urged that it should be adopted.

Explanations of vote before the vote

39. Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America) welcomed the fact that the sponsors had sought to make many positive changes to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.15*, although he regretted that some of the most important rights and freedoms of navigation had not been dealt with in the text. Indeed, while the sixth preambular paragraph reaffirmed the freedom of navigation in the high seas, no mention was made of the freedom of overflight, the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea, the right of transit passage through straits or the right of passage through archipelagic waters. The United States therefore felt constrained to vote against the draft resolution.

40. Mr. AL-ATTAR (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the submission of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48 was justified because Israel continued to refuse to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards, thus threatening the security and stability of the countries of the region and of the entire world. The draft resolution was in line with the wishes expressed by the international community since it committed Israel, like other States of the region, to renounce its nuclear option and to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. In so doing, Israel would be demonstrating that it sincerely sought a way to bring the peace process in the Middle East, which had not yet achieved

(Mr. Al-Attar, Syrian Arab Republic)

the desired results to a conclusion. It would also reassure the other countries of the region.

41. It should be emphasized in that regard, that those who called for the establishment of regional arrangements with a view to monitoring nuclear weapons in the Middle East appeared to forget that there could be no cooperation under the shadow of occupation and annexation and when the rights of others were being denied and the resolutions of competent international authorities remained unimplemented. They also behaved as if they did not recognize that it was the responsibility of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security, which was its raison d'être.

42. Mr. GUILLAUME (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the members of the European Union, said that the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48 was all the more untimely in that with the signing of the Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement in Washington the Middle East peace process had taken a decisive turn. The Twelve also deplored the singling out of a particular country, since the risk of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East was a problem that should be dealt with in a global manner within the framework of the peace talks. It should be recalled in that connection that that was the aim of the Mubarak plan, which had the support of the entire international community. The Twelve shared the aim of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and urged all the countries of the region, including Israel, to accede to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation and to place all their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. Moreover, the issue of the presence of weapons of mass destruction in the region should be dealt with in the framework of the Middle East peace talks.

43. The vote of the members of the European Union should be understood, therefore, as both an appeal to leave the past behind, and a clear message of support for the negotiations under way in the framework of the Middle East peace process.

44. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia) said his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.15*, as its tone and language had undergone a marked adjustment in the right direction. It was apparent from the 1993 report of the Ad Hoc Committee, however, that no concrete result had been achieved in regard to the development of new approaches to peace and security in the Indian Ocean region. It was to be hoped that all the interested States would contribute to the report to be prepared by the Secretary-General in implementation of the resolution.

45. Mr. BERNHARDSEN (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48, said that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East could be brought about only if the countries of the region acted in a spirit of cooperation. In order to establish a climate of confidence, therefore, all the countries of the region should accede to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation and place all their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. In that connection, the singling out of a particular country was a practice that should be eschewed, particularly in view of recent events in the region.

Action on draft resolutions

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.15*

46. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.15*, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", was sponsored by Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Panama and the Philippines.

47. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.15*.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Norther Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey.

48. The draft resolution was adopted by 110 votes to 3, with 32 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48

49. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament", was sponsored by Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

50. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Belarus, Benin, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guyana, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Singapore, Suriname, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, Zambia.

51. The draft resolution was adopted by 55 votes to 39, with 47 abstentions.

Explanations of vote after the vote

52. Mr. TUN (Myanmar) said that the proliferation of nuclear weapons would not only considerably increase the risk of nuclear war but would also constitute a threat to national, regional and world security. He had always supported efforts to strengthen the non-proliferation regime, and found it encouraging in that respect that more than 155 States, including the five nuclear Powers, were now parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which was the cornerstone of that regime. To put an end to the danger of nuclear proliferation, Myanmar urged all those States which had not yet done so to accede to the Treaty and conclude full safeguard agreements with IAEA. His delegation did not think that a resolution directed specifically at a single country, such as the one just adopted, helped to realize the aim in view, and it had therefore abstained in the vote.

53. Mr. BANDURA (Ukraine) said that his country, as a supporter of the principle of the inadmissibility of resort to nuclear weapons and bearing in mind the need to act to stop them spreading, had always backed efforts at the

(Mr. Bandura, Ukraine)

international level to prevent any Government suspected of wishing to acquire such weapons from doing so. However, given the clearly discriminatory approach of the draft resolution - reminiscent of a recent past when confrontation between the blocs had led to the submission of various draft resolutions intended to obtain not concrete results but rather ideological dividends - his delegation had been obliged to abstain in the vote.

54. Mr. CHANDRA (India) said that his delegation's position was unchanged and that, while it continued to support all efforts for the total elimination of all nuclear weapons as part of a world approach, and the establishment of peace and security in the Middle East, it had been obliged to abstain in the vote because it found the singling out of one particular State on that issue inappropriate. If the vote had been taken paragraph by paragraph, his delegation would have voted against operative paragraph 1.

55. Mr. FRIER (Israel) said that the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48 should reflect the position, favourable or otherwise, of the First Committee towards the Middle East peace process. His delegation regretted to see therefore that certain States had sponsored the resolution or voted in favour of it; it hoped that those which had abstained would alter their position over time and warmly thanked those States which, faithful to their convictions, had voted against it.

56. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said he had voted for the draft resolution because he was convinced that what were called, in the third preambular paragraph, the "recent positive developments" in the situation would not lead to the full restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Moreover, he thought that as long as Israel's nuclear weapons were not eliminated from the face of the earth the item "Israeli nuclear armament" ought to stay on the First Committee's agenda.

57. Mr. MARSCHIK (Austria) said that his country had always supported all efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, particularly in the sensitive area of the Middle East. It had always demanded that all countries of the region should adhere to the NPT and place their nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards. Although it had supported draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.35, therefore, his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48: its substance seemed to have been already covered by draft resolution L.35 and its adoption might have been interpreted by some countries in a way that could have adversely affected the climate of the Middle East peace negotiations.

58. Austria attached great importance to the peace process in the Middle East, which in recent months had shown encouraging developments; in particular, the work of its working group on arms control and regional security, in which Austria was participating, was proceeding satisfactorily. A delicate point had been reached and everything should be done to facilitate the peace process in the quest for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

59. Mr. GÜVEN (Turkey) said that by reason of its geographical location his country attached great importance to the preservation of peace and security in the Middle East. It therefore encouraged all States in the region to adhere to the international instruments on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass

(Mr. Güven, Turkey)

destruction. It took every opportunity to call not only on Israel but on all States of the region to accede to the NPT and to place all their nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. It believed that practical steps to that effect would make an important contribution to dissipating the climate of distrust inherent to the region. Turkey had, however, abstained at the current session in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48, which it believed did not cover all the components of the problem relating to nuclear non-proliferation in the Middle East. It would have preferred a text which underlined the responsibility of all the countries in the region to promote nuclear non-proliferation, thus contributing to the maintenance of peace and security in the Middle East.

60. Mr. NEAGU (Romania) said that at the previous two sessions of the General Assembly his delegation had voted against the draft resolution on "Israeli nuclear armament", since it believed it was high time to adopt a new, more constructive approach to the problem of nuclear non-proliferation in the Middle East, in accordance with the positive developments in the relations between States in the region over the previous few years, and especially taking into account the recent breakthrough in the Arab-Israeli peace negotiations. The historic agreement of 13 September 1993 opened up new possibilities for peaceful coexistence and collaboration, not only between their two peoples, but among all the peoples in the region.

61. He was also encouraged by the consensus registered on the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region. A further positive element was the decision to establish an arms control and regional security working group to deal with the sensitive issue of Middle East arms control. His delegation had noted with great interest that the United Nations was working with the group as an extraregional participant.

62. Romania's vote against the draft resolution took into consideration those important positive elements and was conceived as a constructive effort to support the peace process in the Middle East and thereby the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in the region and around the world.

63. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia) said that the past year had seen a substantial improvement in the security climate in several parts of the world, including the Middle East, where there were good prospects that the agreement between Israel and the PLO would stimulate further progress towards peace in that region. The Middle East working group on arms control and regional security had continued to do constructive work, in which Australia had been pleased to participate.

64. His country had consistently urged Israel and other States, both parties and non-parties to the NPT, to live up to the standards of international behaviour set out in the Treaty. It appealed to the few remaining States which had not yet done so, particularly those that operated unsafeguarded nuclear facilities, to join the Treaty.

65. Australia's abstention on the vote on the draft resolution should not be interpreted as anything less than complete support for the calls that Israel should join the NPT and accept complete safeguards on all its nuclear facilities. His country fully shared the concerns expressed in the resolution

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

and supported the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone and a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

66. Mr. GAJDA (Hungary), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Poland and Slovakia, unreservedly associated himself with the statement of the representative of Austria.

67. Mr. GURECKAS (Lithuania) had voted against draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48 for the same reason as the representative of Hungary and associated himself with the latter's statement.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.